30th January 1929]

Appiontment of the Health Officer of the Madras Corporation.

*1173-B *Q.*—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state the decision of the Government with regard to—

(*a*) the appointment of the Health Officer of the Madras Corporation;
(*b*) Government contribution for roads to the Madras Corporation; and
(*c*) the Madras Corporation's contribution to the hospitals in the City?

A.—The hon. Member's attention is invited to the answer to question No. 1173-A.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"With reference to the answer to this question, may I know with reference to clause (*a*) if the hon. Minister can throw any light on that point, since the date of sending the answer?"

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"I am afraid I cannot take the matter any further."

Local Boards

Construction of bridges by the Ganjam District Board.

*1174 *Q.*—Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of bridges across rivers undertaken by the District Board of Ganjam from 1925–1928;

(*b*) the amount of money that Government have agreed to contribute out of the provincial revenue for each of these bridges;

(*c*) the estimated expenditure on each of these bridges;

(*d*) whether any portion of the accumulated railway-cess is being spent on any of these bridges;

(*e*) the extent of control and supervision exercised by the Government or Public Works Department officers in the construction of each of these works;

(*f*) whether the amounts, if any, advanced by the said district board under clause (*d*) for the above purpose were paid as provincial grants or advanced as loans; and

(*g*) if they were advanced as loans, at what rate per cent and in how many instalments they were to be repaid?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*)—

Name of bridge.	Estimated cost.	Commitment for Provincial grants.
	RS.	RS.
1. Bridge over the Bahuda	3,11,000	3,11,000
2. Bridge over the Mahendratanaya	1,99,400	99,700
3. Bridge over the Mahanadi	2,90,750	1,45,375
4. Bridge over the Sandemma Gedda.. ..	31,000	31,000
5. Bridge over the Donai river on the Budambo-Buguda road	46,000	23,000
6. Bridge over the Gudohodo on the Berhampur-Govindapur road	1,90,000	1,42,500
7. Bridge over the Hamsaralli Gedda ..	19,500	9,750
8. Bridge over the Rushikulya river ..	7,00,000	7,00,000

[30th January 1929

(c) The Government have no information.

(d) Sanction has been accorded to meet half the cost of items (3) and (5) and a fourth of the cost of item (6) from the Railway cess accumulations to the credit of the District Board.

(e) All the works except item (8) are executed under the supervision of the District Board Engineering staff; item (8) has been entrusted to Messrs. Braithwaite & Company on a lump-sum contract under the supervision of the Public Works Department.

(f) & (g) A loan of Rs. 90,000 has been sanctioned to the District Board for item (2) repayable in twenty annual instalments, Rs. 50,000 bearing interest at $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum and Rs. 40,000 at $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent per annum.

Alleged appointment of a member of the Tenali Taluk Board as a temporary President before his taking the oath of allegiance.

* 1175 Q.—Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that a member of the Tenali Taluk Board was appointed as the temporary President of that Board in October 1928 by the President, Guntur District Board, before the former had taken his oath of allegiance as a member of the said taluk board;

(b) whether this act was brought to the notice of the Government and was declared by the Government as illegal and set aside by them; and

(c) whether they will be pleased to lay on the Council table a copy of the order referred to in (b) or any such order passed on the subject?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Yes. But the Government did not set aside the appointment of temporary President but only pointed out that he could not function as such, nor convene a meeting.

(c) No.

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"Sir, with reference to the answer to clause (c) may I know the reason why the Government say, 'No'?"

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"I want notice."

Expenditure by local bodies in connexion with addresses to His Excellency the Governor.

* 1176 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have issued any order or rule to the effect that local bodies may spend up to a limit of Rs. 500 in connexion with addresses or receptions to His Excellency the Governor;

(b) if so, the reasons for such an order; and

(c) what are the affairs of local bodies on which His Excellency the Governor can give an answer to them committing the Government?